

fw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/196,680	11/20/1998	STEPHEN J. MEYER	052250-5008	9428

9629 7590 04/14/2003

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

KIM, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

33

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/196,680

Applicant(s)

MEYER ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher S. Kim

Art Unit

3752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14, 15 and 20-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 55-61 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14, 15, 20-54 and 62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 32.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment filed February 24, 2003 is acknowledged.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 20-54 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Tramm.

Fischer discloses a sprinkler comprising: a generally tubular body 30 having a central passageway 31, a closure 40, a trigger 44, a deflector 38; a face portion 76; a canopy portion 62; two frame arms 34; two support arms (no reference numbers); a single flow opening 79. Fischer teaches the use of a deflector 38 shaped and positioned to transform a horizontal flow of water into a spray pattern of droplets dispersed over a generally horizontal, rectangularly-shaped coverage area (see figures 1 and 6). The coverage area may be up to 16 ft x 24 ft (see column 3 lines 55-58). Tramm discloses, in column 5, lines 12-14, a horizontal-type fire protection sprinkler having a K-factor of at least 3.5, or at least 5.0, or at least 7.0, or at least 10.5, or at least 13.0. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the sprinkler of Fischer with the range of K-

factors (greater than 9) as taught by Tramm to provide a specific flow rate depending on pressure.

The device of Fischer in view of Tramm discloses the claimed limitation with the exception of the water flow rate and coverage area being at a height of only three feet below the canopy portion of the deflector. Fischer in view of Tramm discloses the structural limitations, K-factors including the relationship between flow rates and pressures, and the coverage area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have positioned the sprinkler of Fischer in view of Tramm three feet above the coverage area to extinguish fires in three feet high compartments.

Fischer discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the liquid filled glass bulb. Tramm discloses, pictorially, in figure 2, a liquid filled glass bulb 20. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced the trigger of Fischer with the trigger (liquid filled glass bulb) of Tramm to eliminate the need for solder.

Fischer discloses, in column 3, lines 55-58, a coverage area of 16 ft x 24 ft (using a deflector comprising a generally planar face portion and a canopy portion, see figure 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the coverage area is dependent on the fluid pressure, and therefore, any coverage area less than 16 ft x 24 ft can be attained by reducing the pressure (or increasing the K-factor which results in a lower pressure as defined by the formula in column 5, lines 30-38 of Tramm). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adjusted the coverage area depending on the size of the room, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed February 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that one would utilize other structural features of Tramm in modifying Fischer in an attempt to provide a K-factor greater than 9, Tramm teaches, in column 5, lines 30-35, a K-factor relationship which is not limited by deflector structure.

In response to applicant's argument that Fischer does not teach a single flow opening, Fischer teaches a single flow opening 79, the claimed limitations do not preclude additional openings.

In response to applicant's argument that Fischer requires a channel 90, the claim limitations do not preclude such a channel.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3752

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-8336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on (703) 308-2087. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

CK
April 11, 2003



**CHRISTOPHER KIM
PATENT EXAMINER**